



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/018,658	12/21/2001	Kunijuki Kajita	L9289.01227	2181
24257	7590	12/15/2004	EXAMINER	
STEVENS DAVIS MILLER & MOSHER, LLP			CHAUDRY, MUTABA M	
1615 L STREET, NW			ART UNIT	
SUITE 850			PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			2133	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

10/018,658

Applicant(s)

KAJITA, KUNIJUKI

Examiner

Mujtaba K Chaudry

Art Unit

2133

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____


Claim(s) rejected: 34-51.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☒ The drawing correction filed on 30 November 2004 is a) ☒ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 30 November 2004.
10. ☐ Other: _____


ALBERT DECADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants submitted IDS after final rejection which is not considered as per 37 CFR 1.97, MPEP 609. Applicants contend the prior art of record, Kato, does not teach nor suggest an error coding unit to add CRC bits at the end of each data packet as stated in the present application. The Examiner has reviewed the Kato reference and respectfully disagrees. During the interview on Nov. 29, 2004 and in the response submitted Nov. 30th, 2004 (page 6) Applicants pointed out that "...the purpose of the present invention includes segmenting the concatenated code block into code block where each of the code blocks has one of the CRC bits as a last bit thereof..." Kato teaches (Figure 2b), for example, to add dummy data to make the packets of the same length and then in Figure 2c the CRC is attached. See Kato: Abstract, Figure 2a-e, Figure 5a-d, Figure 7a-d, col. 3, lines 25-30 and cols. 9-10. Furthermore, the Examiner would like to make reference to In re Japikse 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950). It is the Examiner's conclusion that the present application is not patentably distinct nor non-obvious over the prior arts of record.


ALBERT DECADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 220